UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,808	05/16/2006	Jean-Marie Bernard	0076144-000009	5954
	7590 09/09/200 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	NILAND, PATRICK DENNIS		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1796		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/09/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/579,808	BERNARD ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Patrick D. Niland	1796	

	Patrick D. Niland	1796						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 August 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavireal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100					
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	-	-					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 35-37,49 and 50. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20-23,25-34 and 38-48. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu of the reasons stated in the final rejection of 4/24/09.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
	/Patrick D Niland/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1796							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly proposed "wherein the compound having at least one biuret bond and at least one aminoalkylsilane unit comprises at least one "true" biuret having: a. two isocyanate units and one alkoxysilane group;

b. one isocyanate unit and two alkoxysilane

functional groups, or

c. three alkoxysilane functional groups

wherein said isocyanate unit(s) and said alkoxysilane group(s) are attached to the same biuret." was not required of the examined claims. It therefore requires further search and consideration of the newly proposed limitations. This newly recited limitation is not seen per se in the originally filed specification. It therefore raises the issue of new matter. The scope of the newly presented limitations requires further consideration also regarding what its scope actually is. For example the newly proposed recitation of "having" does not further state where the biuret group has to "have" the recited "units" and/or "groups". From this perspective, it is not clear that the newly proposed claims do not continue to encompass the scope that is current subject to the pending prior art rejections. It is also not clear that the newly proposed limitation, noted above, only limits the scope of the claims to pages 18-21 argued by the applicant. This consideration is new, given the newly proposed limitations. Further consideration is also required as to whether or not there is any excluded or added scope that is not disclosed in the originally filed specification. Any excluded material by the newly proposed amendment must be considered to see if it is new matter under Ex parte Grasselli. Given the complexity of the technology and claim language involved, these considerations are not proper for after final considerations.